

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,558	03/11/2004	Neil Clarke	144441	2557
23413 75	90 08/15/2006		EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH			DOERRLER, WILLIAM CHARLES	
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3744	
			DATE MAILED: 08/15/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/708,558	CLARKE, NEIL				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		William C. Doerrler	3744				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports. or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	he correspondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLECTION OF THE MAILING DESIGNS OF TH	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply twill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS and the application to become ABAND	TON. De timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 Ja	ulv 2006					
	 _ _ 	action is non-final.					
<u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims		,				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>16-24</u> is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-10,13-15 and 25</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) 3,4,11 and 12 is/are objected to.						
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers	·					
	_						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 March 2004 is/arc; a) □ accorted or b) □ abjected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
			·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
	application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmen	t(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ	•				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform	nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	r No(s)/Mail Date						

Art Unit: 3744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,5-10,13-15 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner in view of Paul and either of Siebert et al or Ikeda et al. Turner discloses applicant's basic inventive concept, a cryostat for an MRI device with a burst disk to ensure safety, substantially as claimed with the exception of using parallel passages with burst disks to enable switching between disks and valves for both the inlets and outlets of the parallel passages which feed into a common outlet. Paul shows parallel passages, each with a burst disk and a valve to control the flow into the parallel passages to be old in the overpressure safety art. Siebert et al and Ikeda et al each show parallel passages with both upstream and downstream valves in the parallel passages with common inlet and outlet passages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention from the teaching of Paul and either Seibert et al or Ikeda et al to modify the cryostat with burst disk overpressurization control by adding a second passage with a burst disk to enable the switching of passages to improve the safety of the device and to enable one disk to be accessed while the other provides protection and to use valves in the downstream section of the parallel passages to stop fluid from entering the passages from the exit.

In regard to claims 5-7 and 13, the type of valves used is seen as a matter of obvious design choice since all the claimed valves are known in the art and no criticality has been shown for using one type of valve over another. In regard to claims 8,9,14 and 15, the pressure at which the burst disks burst is seen as a matter of obvious design choice depending on the desired pressure of the system. In regard to claim 25, Siebert et al shows screens 25 discussed beginning in line 45 of column 19 to prevent blockage of flow, and the valve of Paul is designed so that at least one of the flowpaths will be accessible.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 16-24 are allowed.

Claims 3,4,11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,2,5-10,13-15 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The newly added references show parallel passages for fluid treatment with valves at both the common inlet and common outlet passage.

Art Unit: 3744

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Doerrler whose telephone number is (571) 272-4807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William C Doerrler Primary Examiner Art Unit 3744

WCD